

REMARKS

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant previously supplied complete copies of references with the Information Disclosure Statement. The copies were apparently double-sided and, thus, one side was lost in the process of scanning by the PTO. Applicant is supplying herewith one-sided copies of the references and a duplicate copy of the PTO-1449 so the Examiner can properly indicate consideration of the references.

Rejections based on Prior Art

Applicant appreciates that the Examiner has withdrawn the prior rejection based on Azagury alone. However, Applicant respectfully submits that, at least for the reason that the combination of Azagury and Chieu is improperly made (due to no proper motivation to combine), the rejection based on Azagury and Chieu is improper.

Notwithstanding Applicant's submission of impropriety based on no proper motivation, Applicant submits herewith amendments to the claims. As discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Azagury and Chieu fails to yield the subject matter of the claims.

For example, independent claim 1 recites "by an external program, creating a new isolated execution unit, wherein the external program is outside of the isolated execution unit." Support for this amendment is disclosed, for example, in Applicant's Figure 4.

Using the Examiner's mapping of claim elements to the Azagury reference (in Azagury's Fig. 2), it is clear that the object 36 (which the Examiner contends is the external program) does not create the target machine 40 (which the Examiner contends is the isolated execution unit).

It is further noted that, later in claim 1, it is recited that a communication path is established between the intermediary software component (which recited as being started within the newly created isolated execution unit) and the external program. This is the same external program that creates the isolated execution unit.

Nor does Chieu does not remedy this shortcoming of Azagury. In particular, Chieu does not disclose that the DCOM server 100 (contended by the Examiner to be an isolated execution unit) is created by the DCOM client 150 (contended by the Examiner to be the external program).

Independent claim 16 has been amended in a manner similar to independent claim 1. Applicant incorporates herein, relative to claim 16, the comments made above relative to claim 1.

Independent claim 31 has been amended to recite that the external program and the isolated execution unit are in the same computer system. On the contrary, with both Azagury and Chieu, what the Examiner considers the external program and the isolated execution unit exist in different computer systems. For example, in Azagury, the Examiner refers to a source

machine and target machine. In Chieu, the Examiner refers to a DCOM Client and a DCOM server. As an example in Applicant's specification, the external program may be a browser program, while the isolated execution unit may be a spawned applet.

It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 1, 16 and 31 are allowable over the cited references. It is further respectfully submitted that the respective dependent claims are allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons that the independent claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below. For example, if the Examiner has suggested claim amendments that are considered to put the claims in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Alan S. Hodes
Reg. No.38,185

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300